



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,678	09/15/2003	Takashi Tsuji	1247-0523P	9153
2292	7590	01/03/2006	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				LAO, LUN S
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2644				

DATE MAILED: 01/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/661,678	TSUJI, TAKASHI	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Lun-See Lao	2644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.   |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>09-15-2003</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Introduction*

1 This action is in response to the amendment filed on 10-26-2005. claims. Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 10, 13, have been amended and 15-16; and claims 17-18 have been added. Claims 1-18 are pending.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Satterlund (US PAT. 5,602,902) in view of Morisaki (US PAT. 5,365,580 hereinafter Morisaki).

Consider claim 1, Satterlund teaches a data communication system (See fig.8, (70, modem)) comprising:

communication mode discriminating module (70) for determining a mode of communication based on a call setting control signal (such as, data mode or vice mode) given from a terminal unit (see col. 6 line 28-col.7 line 42);

connection instructing module (86) for instructing to connect a line for transmitting/receiving signals to/from the terminal unit;

line control module (77) for connecting the line in response to an instruction from the

connection instructing module;

transmission/receiving control (86) controlling transmission/receiving of signals indicative of data on the basis of a communication module for data communication, capable of protocol preset for the data communication (see col. 7 line 43-col. 8 line 67); and communication control module (86), in response to a result determination of the mode of communication mode by the communication mode discriminating module (see col. 11 line 9-18), but Satterlund does not clearly teach the case where the data communication is requested, causing the line control module to connect the line to compare an authorization given from the terminal unit via the line with a reference authorization defined in advance and for causing the transmission/receiving control module to start to control the transmission/receiving of the signals only when the authorization coincides with the reference authorization.

However, Morisaki discloses that the data communication is requested, causing the line control module (see col.3 line 59 - col.4 line 28) to connect the line to compare an authorization given from the terminal unit via the line with a reference authorization (see fig. 6 (111,112) – 7 (120,121)) defined in advance and for causing the transmission / receiving control means to start to control the transmission / receiving of the signals only when the authorization (see fig.8 (1b)) coincides with the reference authorization (see col. 2 line 12-56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in that art to utilize the teaching of Satterlund into Morisaki to provide a novel and useful system for detecting unauthorized use of an identifier in a communication system which includes at

least one terminal coupled to a communication center via a communication network (Morisaki, col. 2, lines 16-21).

As to claim 15, it is covered by claim 1 except for capable of making data communication. Refer to claim 1 for rejection. Further, the data communication system of Satterlund as modified by Morisaki is capable of making data communication (see abstract).

As to claim 16, it is a program product claim of claim 1. Refer to claim 1 for rejection.

Consider claim 17, Satterlund the data communication system (see fig.8, (70, modem), wherein the communication mode discriminating module determines the mode of communication is one from a group of voice, data and facsimile communication (see col. (col. 7 line 43-col.8 line 67).

Consider claim 18, Satterlunder does not clearly teaches the data communication system, wherein authorization is only compared when the mode of communication is determined to be data communication. However, it is well know in the art (official notice is taken) such as use a password for lock into the sever or an internet for data communication.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Satterluner by implementing a particular data communication system as claimed for purpose of data protection.

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Satterlund (US PAT. 5,602,902) and Morisaki (US PAT 5,365,580) as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Creamer et al (US PAT 6,028,917hereinafter Creamer).

Consider claim 2, Satterlund as modified by Morisaki differs from claim 2 in not disclosing that the communication control module causes the transmission / receiving control module to convert the requested set of transmission object data into signals on the basis of the communication protocol and transmit the signals.

Creamer teaches storing at least one of predetermined sets of transmission object data, wherein the terminal unit requests to transmit data other than the predetermined sets of transmission object data after starting the control module of transmission / receiving of signal, and wherein the communication control module (see fig. 7e (144)) causes the transmission / receiving control module (see fig. 7f (152,154)) to convert any one of the predetermined sets of transmission object data into signals on the basis of the communication protocol and transmit the signal. When the terminal unit requests to transmit any one of the predetermined sets of transmission object data, the communication control causes the transmission / receiving control module (see fig. 7f (152,154)) to convert the requested set of transmission object data into signals on the basis of the communication protocol and transmit the signals (see fig. 8 (202)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in that art to utilize the teaching of Satterlund and Morisaki with that of Creamer, so that the system provide telephone type services over the Internet to convert the requested set of transmission object data into a signal on the basis of the communication protocol.

5. Claims 3, 6-9,11,14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Satterlund (US PAT. 5,602,902) as modified by Morisaki (US PAT 5,365,580) as applied to claim 1, and further in view of White et al (US PAT 6,069,890 hereinafter White).

Consider claim 3, Satterlund as modified by Morisaki and Creamer differs from claim 3 in not disclosing that the communication control module judges whether or not the transmitted one or more conditions of judgment satisfy one or more predetermined reference conditions for allowing the requested set of transmission object data to be transmitted in response to the request from the terminal unit and only when the one or more conditions of judgment satisfy the one or more predetermined reference conditions, the communication control module causes the transmission/receiving control module to convert the requested set of transmission object data into signals on the basis of the communication protocol and transmit the signal.

White teaches a communication system comprising storing means for storing at least one of the predetermined sets of transmission object data, wherein the terminal unit transmits the request to transmit any one of the predetermined sets of transmission object data and one or more predetermined conditions of judgment, after starting the control of transmission / receiving of signal (see fig.2 and col.5 line 49-col.6 line 6). The communication control judges whether or not the transmitted one or more conditions of judgment satisfy one or more predetermined reference conditions for allowing the requested set of transmission object data to be transmitted in response to the request

from the terminal unit and only when the one or more conditions of judgment satisfy the one or more predetermined reference conditions, the communication control module causes the transmission / receiving control to convert the requested set of transmission object data into signals on the basis of the communication protocol and transmit the signals (see fig.5, col.5 line 49 - col.6 line 6 and col.7 lines 12-44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in that art to further modified Satterlund as modified by Morisaki and Creamer, so that the system provides telephone type services over the Internet for information providers (IPs) constituting the end system which collect and market the information through their own servers.

Regarding claim 6, White discloses that the line contains a part of a public line network, and one of the conditions of judgment is an identification number for discriminating the terminal unit within the public line network (see fig. Col.5, line 52 - col.6 line 5).

Consider claim 7, Morisaki teaches that one of the one or more conditions of judgment is predetermined authorization (see fig.9, col. 1 line 31 - col.2 line 10).

Consider claim 8, Satterlund as modified differs from claims 8 in not disclosing that the data communication system of further comprising storing module for storing at least one of predetermined sets of transmission object data; that the terminal unit transmits the request to transmit any one of the predetermined sets of transmission object data and one or more predetermined conditions of judgment after starting the control of the transmission/receiving of the signal; and that the communication control module judges whether or not the transmitted one or more conditions of judgment

satisfy one or more predetermined reference conditions for allowing the requested set of transmission object data to be transmitted in response to the request from the terminal unit and when the one or more conditions of judgment satisfy the one or more predetermined reference condition the communication control module causes the transmission / receiving control means to convert the requested set of transmission object data into signals on the basis of the communication protocol and transmit the signals, and when the one or more conditions of judgment do not satisfy the one or more reference conditions the communication control means causes the transmission / receiving control module to convert transmission object data other than the requested transmission object data into signals on the basis of the communication protocol and transmit the signals.

Morisaki teaches that when the one or more conditions of judgment do not satisfy the one or more reference conditions, the communication control module causes the transmission/receiving control means to convert transmission object data other than the requested transmission object data into signals on the basis of the communication protocol and transmit the signals (see fig. 9-10).

However, Satterlund as modified fails to teach that the communication system comprising at least one of predetermined sets of transmission object data.

On the other hand, White teaches storing means for storing at least one of predetermined sets of transmission object data; and that the terminal unit transmits the request to transmit any one of the predetermined sets of transmission object data and one or more predetermined conditions of judgment after starting the control of the

transmission/receiving of the signal; and that the communication control module judges whether or not the transmitted one or more conditions of judgment satisfy one or more predetermined reference conditions for allowing the requested set of transmission object data to be transmitted in response to the request from the terminal unit and when the one or more conditions of judgment satisfy the one or more predetermined reference condition the communication control module causes the transmission / receiving control means to convert the requested set of transmission object data into signals on the basis of the communication protocol and transmit the signals (see figs. 5 - 6, col.5 line 64 to col.6 line 9, col.8 line 20 to col.9 line 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modified Satterlund as modified by Morisaki with White, so that the system provides telephone type services over the Internet Public switched telephone networks utilizing program controlled switching system which are arranged in an architecture with the internet to provide a methodology for telephone use of the internet by customers on an impromptu basis.

Consider claim 9, White teaches that one of the one or more conditions of judgment is the specification of the terminal unit related to processing of the set of transmission object data (see fig.5, 6).

Consider claims 11,14, White discloses that the line contains a part of a public line network, and one of the conditions of judgment is an identification number for discriminating the terminal unit within the public line network (see fig.2 col.5 50-62).

White also teaches that the communication protocol is a communication protocol used for data communication on Internet (see fig.4).

6. Claims 4, 5, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Satterlund (US PAT. 5,602,902) as modified by Morisaki (US PAT 5,365,580) and White et al. (US PAT 6,069,890) as applied to claim 3, 8 above, and further in view of Jois et al (US PAT 6,112,242 hereinafter Jois).

Consider claims 4, 5, Satterlund as modified by Morisaki and White differs from claim 4 in not disclosing that the specification of the terminal unit is related to processing of the set of transmission object data and imaging the set of transmission object data.

Jois teaches that the one or more conditions of the specification of the terminal unit is related to processing of the set of transmission object data (see col.3 line 45 to col.4 line 10). Jois also teaches that the terminal unit further comprises imaging module for imaging the set of transmission object data, and one of the one or more conditions of judgment is the specification of the imaging related to imaging the set of transmission object data (see fig.3 and col. 4 lines 10-41).

Therefore, it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the obvious combination of Satterlund, Morisaki and White with Jois to have specification of the terminal unit related to process for improved interactive transaction in a hypertext data processing system operating in a web client-server network.

Consider claims 10, Jois teaches that the terminal unit further comprises imaging means for imaging the set of transmission object data, and one of the one or more conditions of judgment is the specification of the imaging module related to imaging the set of transmission object data (see fig 3, col.1 lines 8-50).

7. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Satterlund (US PAT. 5,602,902) as modified by Morisaki (US PAT 5,365,580) and White et al. (US PAT 6,069,890) as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Creamer (US PAT. 6,028,917 hereinafter Creamer).

Consider claim 12, Satterlund as modified by Morisaki and White differs from claim 12 in not disclosing that one of the one or more conditions of judgment is predetermined authorization.

However, Creamer teaches that one of the one or more conditions of judgment is predetermined authorization (see abstract and fig.4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in that art to utilize the teaching of Satterlund; Morisaki and white with that of Creamer, so that the system provides a service capability for resource management intelligence in the PSTN that expands the type and character of services that may be provided to PSTN customers and other authorized users.

8. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Kamijo (JP6-62148) as modified by Morisaki (US PAT 5,365,580) as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Jois et al (US PAT 6,112,242 hereinafter Jois).

Consider claim 13, Satterlund as modified by Morisaki differs from claim13 in not disclosing received-data storage means capable of storing data and that the communication control module stores data indicated by the received signals in the received-data storage module.

However, Jois teaches that the system further comprising received-data storage means capable of storing data and that the communication control module stores data indicated by the received signals in the received-data storage module (see col.3 line 45 to col.4 line 40).

Therefore, it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the obvious combination of Satterlund, Morisaki with Jois to provide a system and method for implementation of composite Web page that allows a user to send input in one component and interactively view a response from the server in another component of the composite Web page.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Nada (US PAT. 6,381,318) is cited to show other related to data communication system and medium for storing communication control program.

11. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Mail Stop \_\_\_\_ (explanation, e.g., Amendment or After-final, etc.)

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Facsimile responses should be faxed to:  
**(571) 273-8300**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:  
Customer Service Window  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lao,Lun-See whose telephone number is (571) 272-7501. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chin Vivian, can be reached on (571) 272-7848.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

L.S.  
Lao,Lun-See  
Patent Examiner  
US Patent and Trademark Office  
Knox  
571-272-7501



HUYEN LE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Application/Control Number: 10/661,678

Art Unit: 2644

Page 14

Date 12-21-2005